

Remarks

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed September 4, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed September 4, 2008, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 18, 20, 22-25, 34-38, 40, 42-45, 54-58, 60, and 62-65 were pending in the Application. Claims 8-16, 26-33, 46-53, and 66-73 were withdrawn from the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 18, 20, 22, 24-25, 34-38, 40, 42, 44-45, 54-58, 60, 62, and 64-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereafter Park) in view of Beach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,713, hereafter Beach), in view of Berger et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0093344 A1, hereafter Berger), and further in view of Rupert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915, hereafter Rupert). Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park, in view of Beach, in view of Berger, in view of Rupert, and in further view of Official Notice.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present response amends Claims 1, 18, 34, and 54, cancels Claims 6-7, 24-25, 44-45, and 64-65, and adds new Claim 75, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-2, 4-5, 18, 20, 22-23, 34-38, 40, 42, 54-58, 60, 62-63, and 75. Claims 8-16, 26-33, 46-53, and 66-73 remain withdrawn. Withdrawn Claims 26-27, 31, 46-47, 51, 66-67, and 71 have been amended so that they now depend from non-canceled claims. Support for the Claim amendments and the new Claim can be found in the Specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to require second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hierarchical namespace *including representing the plurality of content repositories as a hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node.*

In the Office Action mailed September 4, 2008, while discussing previous Claim 6, the features of which have now been incorporated into Claim 1, the integrated search service of Park was cited as allegedly disclosing incorporating content repositories into a hierarchical namespace including representing content repositories as nodes under a single VCR root node (page 5, item 13 of the Office Action mailed September 4, 2008). However, Park does not appear to teach how the search service disclosed therein also discloses representing content repositories as a hierarchical namespace of nodes. As described by Park, the search service allows for searches based on search conditions and provides the result of the integration (paragraph [0035] of Park). However, Park does not describe any additional features of the search service including any ability to represent content repositories as a hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node.

In the Office Action, Beach was also cited as allegedly disclosing second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hierarchical namespace (page 3, item 9 of the Office Action). Beach discloses a central database resident on a server that contains database objects (Abstract). A database object maintains a list of object IDs and an associated simple name for the object (column 6, lines 7-8). Directory objects may include other directory objects as part of the list, and there is a single distinguished object called the “root” directory (column 6, lines 8-11). The sequence of directory objects traversed, starting at the root directory and continuing until the object of interest is found, is called a “path” to the object, the path indicating a particular location within the hierarchical namespace created among all directory objects present in the database (column 6, lines 11-16). In other words, Beach incorporates contents of only a single content repository into a hierarchical namespace.

However, Claim 1, as amended, now requires that the second functions also include representing the plurality of content repositories as a hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node. Thus, while Beach discloses how to organize contents of a single directory into a hierarchical namespace, Beach does not disclose how to organize a plurality of *content repositories* as a hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR node.

Thus, for the above reasons, Park and Beach, in combination, do not make obvious second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hierarchical namespace including representing the plurality of content repositories as a hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR node, as required by Claim 1. Further, Rupert and Berger also do not teach this deficiency of Park and Beach.

Claim 1 has also been amended to require third functions for extending a VCR content model to represent information in the plurality of content repositories including sharing a common representation of combined content of the plurality of content repositories as the hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node between the API and a content repository service provider interface (SPI) implemented by each of the plurality of content repositories. In the Office Action, while discussing previous Claim 7, similar features of which have now been incorporated into Claim 1, Park was cited as allegedly disclosing sharing a common representation of content between the API and the SPI because Park discloses fetching a container from a content repository through a repository content manager, loading the container on to the memory of the service publication server, and converting the container into a container DOM object (paragraph [0059] of Park).

However, Claim 1, as amended, now requires that the third functions include sharing a common representation of combined content of the plurality of content repositories *as the hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node* between the API and a content repository service provider (SPI) implemented by each of the plurality of content repositories. Because the API and the SPI share a common representation of combined content of the plurality of content repositories, it makes it easier, for example, for an API object to map a request to one or more SPI objects. In contrast, Park does not disclose an SPI implemented by

each of the plurality of content repositories, nor does Park disclose sharing a common representation of content as the hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node between the API and the SPI.

Thus, Park does not disclose third functions for extending a VCR content model to represent information in the plurality of content repositories including sharing a common representation of combined content of the plurality of content repositories as the hierarchical namespace of nodes under a single VCR root node between the API and a content repository service provider interface (SPI) implemented by each of the plurality of content repositories, as required by Claim 1, as amended. Further, Rubert, Beach, and Berger also do not teach this deficiency of Park.

Claim 1 has also been amended to require that the application program interface is compatible with the content repository service provider interface (SPI) that maps operations on the VCR content model to the plurality of content repositories. In the Office Action, Park was cited as allegedly disclosing that the application program interface is compatible with a content repository service provider interface (SPI) because Park discloses that a content producer can use a content manipulation API in the service publication server (paragraph [0069]). However, while the cited passage in Park states that a user of a system can use an API, there is no mention of any SPIs that map operations on the VCR content model to the plurality of content repositories. As discussed above, SPIs are implemented by each of the plurality of content repositories. By having each of the plurality of content repositories implement the SPI in order to map operations on the VCR content model to the plurality of content repositories, the VCR does not have to worry about implementing different drivers for a multitude of content repository systems. Instead, any content repository implementing the SPI can plug into the VCR. In contrast, while Park mentions the use of a multitude of data sources (figure 1), Park does not disclose that each of the data sources implement an SPI in order to map operations on a VCR content model to the plurality of data sources.

Thus, Park does not disclose that the application program interface is compatible with the content repository service provider interface (SPI) that maps operations on the VCR content model to the plurality of content repositories, as required by Claim 1, as amended. Further, Rubert, Beach, and Berger also do not teach this deficiency of Park.

In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to require fourth functions for traversing the hierarchical namespace incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is also not taught by Park, Rupert, Beach, and Berger, alone or in combination.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 34, and 54

Claims 18, 34, and 54 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 18, 34, and 54 are likewise not obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-5, 20, 22-23, 35-38, 40, 42, 55-58, 60, and 62-63

Claims 2, 4-5, 20, 22-23, 35-38, 40, 42, 55-58, 60, and 62-63 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the features that they provide. Applicants respectfully submit that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 6-7, 24-25, 44-45, and 64-65

Claims 6-7, 24-25, 44-45, and 64-65 have been canceled by the present response.

IV. Withdrawn Claims

Claims 8-16, 26-33, 46-53, and 66-73 remain withdrawn. Claims 26-27, 31, 46-47, 51, 66-67, and 71 have been amended so that they now depend on non-canceled claims. Should the independent claims be allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the withdrawn claims be considered and also allowed.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800